

Application No. 09/808,857
Amendment "A" dated September 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2004

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on August 25, 2004. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview. In particular, claims 1, 14, 21-23, 30 and 32 have been amended,¹ while claims 4, 9-13, 16 and 25-29 have been cancelled, and new claims 33-37 have been added, such that claims 1-3, 5-8, 14-15, 17-24 and 30-37 remain pending, of which claims 1, 14, 21 and 30 are the independent claims at issue.

In first Office Action, dated July 12, 2004, claims 1-32 were considered and rejected in view of Montulli (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,242) and Callaghan (U.S. Publication No. US2002/0007317).² Some of the claims were also rejected for certain informalities under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, which have been overcome by amendment or which were traversed during the interview and should therefore be withdrawn.³

As discussed during the interview, and as recited in claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method for generating cookies at a server for a client such that a web site requested by the client can be customized for the client. The recited method includes storing user information and cookie requirement information at the server that can be used to generate cookies. The cookie requirement information, corresponding to registered web sites, specifies what data fields are expected in cookies submitted from a client to the web site. The method also includes having the server provide a list of the registered web sites to the client such that the client, prior to obtaining a document from a particular web site, can determine whether the

¹ Support for the claim amendments and new claims is drawn from various portions of the application including, but not limited to, pages 6, 19-21; Figures 3-4; and the corresponding disclosure to Figures 3-4 as referenced during the interview.

² Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Montulli (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,242). Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-19 and 21-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Callaghan (U.S. Publication No. US2002/0007317). Claims 8, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Callaghan in view of Montulli². Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

³ In particular, the term "can" has been removed from the claims and the rejections to claims 9 and 25 are now moot due to their cancellation. Certain other § 112 rejections were improper, however, and should be withdrawn, as discussed during the interview. In particular, as discussed during the interview, rejections under § 112 based on the interpretation of "web site" is improper inasmuch as the Examiner should interpret the term in the broadest sense, unless otherwise restricted by the language of the claims and/or specification. The rejections based on a lack of antecedent basis are also improper inasmuch as the phrase "the method comprising" has adequate antecedent basis provided.

Application No. 09/808,857
Amendment "A" dated September 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2004

particular web site is on the list of web sites provided by the server. The server then, having received an indication that the client is accessing the web site, which is registered with the server, generates one or more new cookies associated with the requested web site based on the stored cookie requirement information and the stored user information. The server then transmits the one or more newly generated cookies to the client so that the client can transmit the one or more newly generated cookies to the web site to obtain a customized web document from the web site.

The other independent claims 14, 21 and 30 also recite similar methods having similar claim elements. For example, claim 14 is directed to a computer program product having computer-executable instructions for implementing the method recited in claim 1. Claims 21 and 30 also include elements similar to those recited in claim 1, only recited from the perspective of the client rather than the server, with claim 21 directed to a method and claim 30 directed to a complementary computer program product.

As discussed during the interview, these claims are neither anticipated by nor made obvious by the art of record. Although Montulli and Callaghan both recite methods and systems for generating cookies, both of these references teach the need for storing the cookies. In contrast, while Applicant's invention may include the storage of cookies, it is not necessary. Instead, the generation of cookies can be performed by the server each time the client requests a document (claim 37). Accordingly, the client can access the customized web document without storing any of the cookies (claim 34).

The cited art also fails to disclose that cookies are not generated until after the client checks a list of registered web sites that is provided to the client by the server. Instead, the cited art only teaches how cookies are transmitted to the client for storage or other information for generating cookies at the client.

For at least the same reasons that the art fails to teach the invention described and claimed above, the art also fails to teach that a client checks the list of registered web sites prior to issuing any request for a document from any web site to verify whether the requested web site is on the list of web sites as recited in new claim 33.

Application No. 09/808,857
Amendment "A" dated September 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2004


Yet other embodiments that are not anticipated or obviated by the art of record include the embodiments recited in claims 34 and 35, wherein the server generates a plurality of different cookies for different fields specified in the cookie requirement information with relevant user information, and wherein the server generates at least one cookie that combines multiple items of the cookie requirement information and relevant user information.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims 1-3, 5-8, 14-15, 17-24 and 30-37 are now in condition for prompt allowance.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8 day of September 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\14531\92\CM0000004184V001.DOC